

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney
DAVID L. GAPP
Assistant United States Attorney
2500 Tulare Street
Suite 4401
Fresno, California 93721
Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JACOB JACOBSEN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00304-ADA-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
[PROPOSED] FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: September 27, 2023
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

This case is scheduled for a status conference on July 26, 2023, but the parties have agreed to move this hearing to September 27, 2023.

Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of [her] findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be “relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act continuances “in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.” *United States v. Olsen*, 21 F.4th 1036, 1047 (9th Cir. 2022). That non-exhaustive list includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained;

(3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy trial rights since the case's inception; (4) whether a defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is particularly susceptible to complications if infected with the virus; (5) the seriousness of the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6) whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges against the defendant are dismissed; and (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a trial. *Id.*

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7). When continued, this court should designate a new date for the hearing. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be "specifically limited in time").

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and through defendant's counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on July 26, 2023. The Court more recently has invited a continuance of this hearing if counsel do not believe that anything substantial can be accomplished at the currently scheduled hearing.

2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the next status conference be scheduled for September 27, 2023, and to exclude time between July 26, 2023, and September 27, 2023, under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

a) Defense counsel, with the assistance of an investigator, has completed the review of all available evidence. An additional continuance is required to permit appointed counsel to finish discussing with the defendant how best to resolve his case. Defense counsel has requested a proposed resolution from the government.

b) The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request.

c) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

d) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from July 26, 2023, to September 27, 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: July 18, 2023

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney

/s/ David Gappa
DAVID L. GAPP
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: July 19, 2023

/s/ DOUGLAS FOSTER
DOUGLAS FOSTER
COUNSEL FOR
JACOB JACOBSEN,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JACOB JACOBSEN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00304-ADA-BAM
[PROPOSED] FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: September 27, 2023
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

[PROPOSED] FINDINGS AND ORDER

The court has reviewed and considered the stipulation filed by the parties on July 19, 2023, and also reviewed the record of this case. For the reasons stated in the stipulation the period of time from July 26, 2023, through September 27, 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO FOUND AND ORDERED on July ____, 2023.

THE HONORABLE BARBARA A. McAULIFFE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE